

The Sun

SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1911.

Published at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.
DAILY, Per Month.....\$1.00
DAILY, Per Year.....\$10.00
SUNDAY, Per Year.....\$2.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year.....\$12.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month.....\$1.00
Postage to foreign countries added.
All checks, money orders, etc., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Treasurer of the Association, M. F. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, D. W. Quinn, 170 Nassau street.

London office, 10, Abchurch Lane, E. C. 4, London, E. C. 4, England. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, 10, Abchurch Lane, E. C. 4, London, E. C. 4, England.

Paris office, 4, Rue de la Michodière, au Rue du Quatre Septembre (near Place de l'Opéra). The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel, Kiosque 27, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra, and Kiosque 10, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who take us with manuscripts for publication will please send them to the office, they will be in all cases well received and returned.

Mr. Rainey's Panama Resolution.

The best thing that the Sixty-second Congress can do is to get through with the necessary business of the extra session and adjourn on the earliest possible day. There is no public demand for the luxuries and superfluities of legislation, such proceedings, for example, as are contemplated by the resolution introduced on Thursday by the Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY of Illinois directing the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate Colonel ROOSEVELT'S insane boast at the University of California the other day about his part in the inception of the Panama Canal.

I started it. If I had followed traditional conservative methods I would have submitted a dignified state paper of probably two hundred pages to Congress, and the debate on it would have gone on yet; but I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on the canal does also.

Of course, as everybody ought to know, Colonel ROOSEVELT never "took" the Canal Zone without consulting Congress. The use, occupation and control of the territory in question was granted to the United States in perpetuity by the Republic of Panama in Article II. of the treaty of November 18, 1903, which was properly negotiated on the part of this Government by JOHN HAY, Secretary of State, and duly submitted to the Senate of the United States, ratification being advised by that constitutional body on February 23, 1904.

If Colonel ROOSEVELT now goes about bragging that he did lawlessly what was in fact done lawfully, his foolish utterances on the subject injure nobody but himself. It is not even necessary to convict him of inconsistency of statement, as the World has attempted to do by exhibiting from his special message of December 15, 1908, the subjoined paragraph, which, however, related to another transaction than the "taking" of the Canal Zone:

"The Congress took the action it did after the most minute and exhaustive examination and discussion and the Executive carried out the direction of Congress to the letter. Every act of this Government, every act for which this Government has the slightest responsibility, was in pursuance of the act of Congress here."

The message from which this is quoted by our neighbor had nothing whatever to do with the acquisition of the Canal Zone by the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty of 1903, and is therefore not pertinent to the foolishness of the speech in California the other day. Nevertheless it will be much more useful for Congress to ignore the remark of this private citizen and devote its time to reciprocity with Canada and other important matters. To devote solemn official attention to the veracity or inconsistency of Colonel ROOSEVELT'S autobiographical statements would not be a rewarding enterprise; it would be almost as unprofitable as undertaking a general investigation of his personal modesty or of the precision of his syntax. Congress ought to be satisfied to do what the rest of the country is doing; to listen to him when it cannot get out of the range of his voice, and to dismiss with a weary smile whatever it cannot help hearing.

In the Kindergarten.

The so-called "reform" or insurgent fraction of the voting population of this State has at the present moment a simple and admirably clear alternative. It may decide to cast its valuable strength with the Democratic party, led by CHARLES F. MURPHY, or with the Republican party, directed by WILLIAM BARNES, JR. It is also possible for it to flock by itself, but this would insure too damaging a revelation of numerical insignificance.

The situation of the Democratic and Republican parties under the leadership indicated above is equally simple. They can proceed to carry out the policies adopted by a majority of each party as represented in the present control and await the decision of the voting public as to which deserves power, or they can engage in an interesting competition to decide which shall earn the doubtful applause and even more doubtful support of the "insurgents."

But no concession Mr. BARNES or Mr. MURPHY now makes to the insurgents will insure future support. Therefore ROOSEVELT made a gallant effort to pander to the "insurgents" at Saratoga last year, but Mr. MURPHY got their votes for his ticket. Mr. BARNES last week made a historic effort to join the regular Republicans to the "insurgent" Democrats, yet it may be seriously doubted if he ever gets even a vote of thanks for his public spirited statesmanship.

With or without the help of Mr. BARNES, Mr. MURPHY can now count on the Democratic party to all the Hughes

policies. But if he does he will be mistaken in counting upon any insurgent help; that will be found enlisted by Mr. BARNES in the next fight to overthrow Tammany control in the State. Mr. BARNES by joining the Republican strength to the "insurgent" Democrats may be able to pass the Hinman-Green bill, but even if he does he need look for no "insurgent" support as a reward; that will be assured to Mr. MURPHY in the next battle to drive the "old guard" out of politics.

These facts are so elementary that they seem foolish when reduced to print. Yet at the present moment it seems difficult to decide whether Mr. BARNES or Mr. MURPHY will be the more successful in permitting a small and ineffective faction in the political life of this State to make the regular Republican or Democratic party its fortunate ally in carrying out its policies.

The real friends of minority rule in this State are not the Hon. THOMAS MOTT OSBORNE and the Hon. WILLIAM BARNES, JR.; they are the Hon. WILLIAM BARNES, JR., and the Hon. CHARLES F. MURPHY. Such friendship is the most unselfish this State has ever seen, but how long is it to last?

Pass the Bill!

The Canadian reciprocity agreement is likely to encounter snags in the Senate but will probably pass the House by a vote of not far from 3 to 1. The Democratic majority in the House is effectively committed to it, and it has considerable support on the Republican side. There is therefore no proper reason to delay. It may be "good politics" to hold the measure back for use as a political club to compel or induce approval of other bills that the new majority desires to write into the laws, but the people of the country would welcome the consideration of measures on their merits, the abolition of log rolling.

Mr. TAYLOR'S conviction that the proposed agreement is favored by a large majority of the American people is the result of broad and careful inquiry. He says correctly that "the volume of support which has developed shows that its national scope is fully appreciated and is responsive to the popular will." It is equally true that the country will be best pleased by prompt action. Obstruction and delay, for which there is no good reason whatever, will only irritate and offend. "Good politics," from a purely political standpoint, may suggest some political benefit through delay, but good politics from the standpoint of good citizenship and national integrity demands the prompt approval of the bill.

If it is deemed necessary or desirable to make further changes in the tariff schedules they should be made because they are necessary or desirable; and those who vote for them should have the courage to assume responsibility for their acts. If the Democrats in the House believe, as they declare, that their present majority is due to a national protest against the failure of the last Congress to reduce effectively the tariff schedules, their acts should support their belief. They will lose rather than gain by using the Canadian agreement as a "club" or as a basis for vote trading.

The Canadian bill should be passed at once and in its original form.

The Ninth Cavalry Incident.

The Ninth Cavalry flurried at San Antonio proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that there is no war crisis in Texas. If the people down there heard the bugles blowing for an advance to the Rio Grande to await developments the Ninth would be one of the most popular regiments in the army, for it is one of the smartest and most efficient. As regards discipline it compares well with any regiment of white soldiers. The negroes of the Ninth give a reader and more respectful obedience to their officers than the white enlisted men of any other command in the service do to theirs. As to the general behavior of the negro troopers on leave, no matter where they are stationed, it leaves little to be desired by the most prejudiced critics.

"The sentiment here is against them," says Chief of Police NEWMAN of San Antonio, "but they are orderly." In the early days of the mobilization some of the troopers of the Ninth were inclined to resent the enforcement of the Jim Crow law on the street cars in their cases. While their attitude as soldiers wearing the same uniform as the enlisted men of the Seventh Cavalry was logical enough, the law is the law, and we have no doubt that Colonel JOHN F. GRILFOYLE told them that when they were in San Antonio they must do as the San Antonio negroes do and keep out of the white compartment of the street cars. In Texas the color line is more stringently drawn than in other Southern States, and San Antonio is no exception, although if the townsmen remember the Alamo it must occur to them that at least one negro shared the perils of TRAVIS, CROCKETT, BOWIE and HOUSTON. Probably the men of the Ninth got it into their heads that war was imminent and that under the circumstances they would be allowed to have the same indulgences they enjoy in garrison in Wyoming and Montana, where there is no color line. They ought to have known better.

At last accounts the negro troopers were submitting in a true military spirit to the discrimination of the Jim Crow law, and official San Antonio was going bail for them and pleading with the President not to order the regiment into the border district represented by the Hon. JOHN NANCE GARNER. If the black soldiers were an incubus and a nuisance, would not this appeal to Mr. TAYLOR be proof of an unselfish and self-sacrificing spirit? We note that the Hon. JAMES L. SLAYDEN of the San Antonio district, a member of the House Military Committee, has taken a prominent part in rebuking Representative GARNER for interfering in its affairs. In San Antonio everybody, Mexicans as well as Americans, votes for Jim SLAYDEN on election day, and if the conduct of the Ninth were as black as GARNER of Vaudeville painted it, Mr. SLAYDEN would

have rejoiced to see the regiment transferred to Representative GARNER'S district. That gentleman now understands what a boomerang is. The clamor in Zapata and Hidalgo against the coming of the Ninth for patrol duty sent Mr. GARNER on the wings of the morning to the White House to protest, and the regiment, which did not know but it might be despatched to Death Valley, received a third and final order to stay where it was.

The hysteria will now die down, we trust. There would have been none at all if there were anticipations of another Palo Alto or Hescas de la Palma.

Castoff Clothing.

The announcement from Albany that the Governor and the leaders of the majority in the Legislature have decided to postpone until next year the reform of the primary election machinery of the State is the most convincing evidence of the survival of sanity at the capital which has yet been disclosed.

The next Republican candidate for Governor will not reproach his Democratic opponent with the failure of his party to enact direct primary legislation. The next Republican platform will not declare for the Hughes primary plan. The Republican party has already cast this disguise, and its leaders in the State committee, the Senate and Assembly are openly hostile to the proposition.

The Democratic party asked the support of the voters of the State last year on the issue of State finance. It promised to reduce State expense, curtail the budget, and at the same time restore efficiency. These promises it has still to fulfill. If it keeps them it can thereafter await the next election with perfect serenity.

The results in village elections in the State continue to demonstrate that the Democratic tide of last fall is still running. It is a fortunate sign for the Democratic future in the State if the Democratic party has decided to stick to its own doctrines rather than pick up Republican castoffs.

The Butcher of Vowels.

Much as the good would like to see reduced ASTREA and the lamb lying down by the side of the lion, as on the millennium plates, and horrid war silent forever save against the Money Power, the Octopus, the Curse of Gold, the Robber Barons, Predatory Wealth, Malefactors of Great Wealth and the other ancient villains of the show, can even the good forgive the havoc which the Thane of Skibo continues to make among innocent English vowels? Can even the most sheeplike and pigeon-livered of men refrain from donning the war bonnet and digging up the hatchet when he sees the Thane, who pretends all the time to have at gizzard "the great moral cause" of arbitration with Great Britain, piling the ground with his slain victims: "hed," "hav," "involve," "formid," "believe," "because," "preserve"?

And many another gory corpse would be piled dumbly for vengeance had it not been dragged out of sight by some of the private secretaries whose business it is to see that ANDREW is translated. Whatever ancient and mostly forgotten grudges the United States may have had against Great Britain, that country has never butchered spelling; and we dare say she would fight until her eyelids could no longer wag for the utmost punctilious "u" in "favour" and "honour." Much more, then, would she scorn to submit to arbitration vital vowels and consonants, such as the Thane's Simplified Spelling Board seeks to sacrifice that all the world may be forced to imitate the native negligences of the Caledonian cackographer.

No, the national spelling can never yield to the "individualistic" Carnegie; and "the sons of Columbia" need shudder at ANDY'S bad spelling, however he raves. Is the Hon. GEORGE KONIG of the Third Maryland district, a new member, being treated with the respect he deserves in the columns of the Baltimore Sun? It declares that he was "too busy piling up a majority in the First ward for Preston and the organization ticket in the Baltimore primaries" to take his seat at the opening of Congress, and in consequence Mr. KONIG will have to shout "Mr. Speaker" from the last row of the orchestra circle in the House when he desires recognition.

It seems that Mr. TALBOTT and Mr. COVINGTON of Maryland, who are old stagers, tried to preempt a seat for the absentee by assigning a page to "hold down" a good chair, but a "breezy Westerner" came along with acquisition in his eye, and there was this colloquy:

SEN. TALBOTT: "Where is Mr. KONIG?"
SEN. COVINGTON: "He isn't here to-day."
SEN. TALBOTT: "Well, you go over and hold that one in that back seat for Mr. KONIG. I'll hold this one myself."

The story is a shock to the sense of reverence. As a Representative in Congress the Hon. GEORGE KONIG ought to loom larger in the Maryland regard. It is right that CHAMP CLARK'S gavel should be of wood from a haunted mill. The reverent sinner at the foot of Dollar Bill, the ecstatic swallower of every Bryanism and Bedlamism, the meek suppliant for the succession—why, the ghosts of a hundred dead issues must tremble in and speak from that Speaker's binnacle. It is already whispered in Washington that of its own accord and held in no man's hand the gavel has been known to hammer the desk tremendously sixteen times in succession.

New York needs some outlet for its surplus population and I want to issue this invitation now and the rest of the time to the Mercury for the purpose of overhauling to come to Boston—Major Fitts of Boston.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

Why, it's a loving and fair offer. If Boston suffers from overcrowding along the North side of the harbor, let the Mercury take a ship to a "boat" give a sailor man a lift, unless she is a beef boat.

FISHERMEN'S CHANCE.

An Eloquent Appeal for Cooperation Among Sportsmen.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Complaints are heard every year from trout fishermen that the fish are scarce, and the scarcity of game fish, their small size and so forth, but it is seemingly never occurs to them that it is principally their own fault. There are very few men who go angling for trout or bass but can afford to be members of some organized club. This argument also applies to the hunter of birds, game, etc. Each of these several groups condemns the Government, the State and all officials, in fact every man but one who needs to be in receipt of more than received to-day. It was informed that a certain man had caught 150 trout in eight hours; about one every three minutes! These fish hogs are partly at fault, but more and more they are at fault. In particular the men who will not organize and prevent such crimes, not only against the laws of the State but against the laws of the Golden Rule. Had this stream been protected, as such a stream should be, no man would have taken the chance of capturing a trout, and the result would have been a rabbit or some such, ruffed grouse or pheasant, all in their season.

It would seem an easy matter to get 100, 200 or even 500 men together to enjoy such sport. The only difficulty is in the knowledge of the difficulty of getting a seventy-five men together to enjoy all at first glance seemed ridiculously small.

In another case a sportsman who really was a sportsman, for he had no other means of spending his leisure time, had spent nearly four years endeavoring to locate a section which would be near enough to New York to make a pleasant and inexpensive trip, and after he had spent hundreds of dollars in the endeavor, he was told that the section was not available, and he was told that the section was not available, and he was told that the section was not available.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

There is only one logical solution of the problem. Sportsmen, get together! Either form a club among your friends or join one of the clubs which are in existence. Help each other, and you will have a better time than you have had in the past.

THE SUPREME COURT ON THE CORPORATION TAX.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

The Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered its decision on the Corporation Tax. The decision is a landmark one, and it is one that will have far-reaching consequences. The Court has held that the Corporation Tax is constitutional, and it has held that the tax is to be levied on the net income of the corporation.

BAITING THE RAILROADS.

Demagogues Cause Lack of New Equipment and Small Earnings.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Two significant items of news are before the public as the result of the mail of the week. The first is the fact that the railroads are not buying new equipment, and the second is the fact that the railroads are not earning much money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Two significant items of news are before the public as the result of the mail of the week. The first is the fact that the railroads are not buying new equipment, and the second is the fact that the railroads are not earning much money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Two significant items of news are before the public as the result of the mail of the week. The first is the fact that the railroads are not buying new equipment, and the second is the fact that the railroads are not earning much money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Two significant items of news are before the public as the result of the mail of the week. The first is the fact that the railroads are not buying new equipment, and the second is the fact that the railroads are not earning much money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Two significant items of news are before the public as the result of the mail of the week. The first is the fact that the railroads are not buying new equipment, and the second is the fact that the railroads are not earning much money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Two significant items of news are before the public as the result of the mail of the week. The first is the fact that the railroads are not buying new equipment, and the second is the fact that the railroads are not earning much money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Two significant items of news are before the public as the result of the mail of the week. The first is the fact that the railroads are not buying new equipment, and the second is the fact that the railroads are not earning much money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Two significant items of news are before the public as the result of the mail of the week. The first is the fact that the railroads are not buying new equipment, and the second is the fact that the railroads are not earning much money.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: